

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

AYS

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 1:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since AYS's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: AYS

SITE: Lynwood Elementary School (MSD Decatur Township)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 1 tutor

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1

DATE: April 16, 2007

REVIEWER: ST/MC

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:40pm

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		One tutor worked individually with a student. Student read a story out loud to the tutor. Tutor encouraged student to attempt to pronounce difficult words on his own but also suggested resources student could use to help him correctly pronounce the more challenging words (i.e. using student's prior knowledge of short and long vowel sounds, breaking words into smaller easier to manage sections, and other phonics techniques). Tutor also periodically stopped the student to ask reading comprehension questions. Observed lesson matches original description in provider application. Tutor effectively used Reading Recovery techniques that focused on fluency, vocabulary and comprehension instruction as described in provider application.
Instruction is clear	X		Tutor provided clear directions to the student. Tutor appropriately addressed questions posed by the student. Student understood what was expected of him.
Time on task is appropriate	X		Student was engaged in the lesson and actively participated throughout the lesson.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		Tutor provided feedback when appropriate. Tutor coached the student without simply giving the answer when the student was challenged by pronouncing a word correctly or a reading comprehension question. Tutor asked student questions to determine how effectively he understood the content of the story he read to the tutor. Tutor's questions encouraged the student to make connections between his own life and the book he read.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>1:1</u>	X		Application notes that the ratio will be 15:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 1:1 ratio and individual instruction was observed.